





# Horace Greeley decently Dissected,

I N A

## LETTER ON HORACE GREELEY,

ADDRESSED BY

A. O A K E Y H A L L

TO

JOSEPH HOXIE, Esq.,

REPUBLISHED (WITH AN ALPHABET OF NOTES) BY POPULAR REQUEST.

### “SELF-GOVERNMENT.

“WE HAVE REPEATEDLY SAID, AND WE ONCE MORE INSIST, THAT THE GREAT PRINCIPLE EMBODIED BY JEFFERSON IN THE DECLARATION OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE, THAT GOVERNMENTS DERIVE THEIR JUST POWER FROM THE CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED, IS SOUND AND JUST; AND THAT, IF THE SLAVE STATES, THE COTTON STATES, OR THE GULF STATES ONLY, CHOOSE TO FORM AN INDEPENDENT NATION, THEY HAVE A CLEAR MORAL RIGHT TO DO SO. WE HAVE NEVER SAID, NOR INTIMATED, THAT THIS IS A RIGHT TO BE CLAIMED IN A FREAK OF A PET, AND EXERCISED WITH THE LEVITY OF A BEAU CHOOSING HIS PARTNER FOR A DANCE. WE DO NOT BELIEVE—WE HAVE NEVER MAINTAINED—that a state might break out of the Union like a bull from a pasture—that one state, or ten states, might take themselves off in a huff—much less make a feint of going, in order to be bribed to stay; but we have said, and still maintain, that, provided the Cotton States have fully and definitely made up their minds to go by themselves, there is no need of fighting about it; for they have only to exercise reasonable patience, and they will be let off in peace and good will. whenever it shall be clear that the great body of the southern people have become conclusively alienated from the Union, and anxious to escape from it, we will to our best to forward their views.”—HORACE GREELEY, *Tribune*, Feb. 23, 1861.

—♦♦♦—

N E W Y O R K :  
ROSS & TOUSEY, No. 121 NASSAU STREET,

GENERAL AGENTS FOR PUBLISHERS, NEWSDEALERS, AND BOOKSELLERS.

1862.

---

WYNKOOP, HALLENBECK & THOMAS, PRINTERS,  
No. 113 FULTON STREET, NEW YORK.

---

## INDEX TO THE ALPHABET OF NOTES.

	PAGE
NOTE <i>a.</i> THE "CASUS BELLI" . . . . .	7
<i>b.</i> THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN "MY BULL AND YOUR OX" . . . . .	7
<i>c.</i> HOW HORACE GREELEY DEMOLISHES POLITICAL FOES . . . . .	8
<i>d.</i> HORACE GREELEY'S FAMOUS CONFESSION TO "PATER" SFWARD . . . . .	9
<i>e.</i> AN APPLICATION FROM PECKSNIFF . . . . .	14
<i>f.</i> "SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS" DEFINED . . . . .	14
<i>g.</i> THE ANCIENT AND MODERN NARCISSUS . . . . .	15
<i>h.</i> THE FIELD AGAINST THE FAVORITE . . . . .	17
<i>i.</i> A QUOTATION WHICH MUST BE READ TO BE APPRECIATED . . . . .	17
<i>j.</i> THE HON. JOHN B. HASKIN AND HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	17
<i>k.</i> CHIEF JUSTICE TANEY AND HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	18
<i>l.</i> EDWIN FORREST AND HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	18
<i>m.</i> JUDGE DALY AND HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	18
<i>n.</i> HARPER BROTHERS AND HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	20
<i>o.</i> EDWARD EVERETT AND HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	20
<i>p.</i> { RETRACTIONS AND MAGNANIMITY <i>vs.</i> HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	21
ARCHBISHOP HUGHES AND HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	21
REV. WM. ADAMS, D. D., AND HORACE GREELEY . . . . .	21
<i>q.</i> HORACE GREELEY IN THE LOBBY . . . . .	23
<i>r.</i> { HORACE GREELEY AND THE MONEY QUESTION . . . . .	25
HORACE GREELEY AND THE MOTIVES OF MONEYED MEN . . . . .	25
<i>s.</i> FAC-SIMILE OF THE NATION'S WAR-CRY . . . . .	26
<i>t.</i> HORACE GREELEY <i>not</i> THE TRIBUNE . . . . .	27
<i>u.</i> HORACE GREELEY'S EPITAPH, WRITTEN BY HIMSELF . . . . .	27
<i>v.</i> A BLASPHEMOS EDITORIAL, ESPECIALLY COMMENDED TO CLERICAL ADMIRERS	28
<i>w.</i> HORACE GREELEY HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR HIS SHARE OF THE WAR . . .	29
<i>x.</i> HALF A DOZEN TREASONABLE EDITORIALS . . . . .	32
<i>y.</i> WHAT IS A COMMON-LAW NUISANCE . . . . .	37
<i>z.</i> THE EXTRACTS FROM THE NEWSPAPER FILES VINDICATED . . . . .	37



## PREFATORY.

---

THE letter which forms the basis of this *brochure* was published in the *Leader* of December 14, 1860 ; and subsequently was copied by the *Herald*, January 4, 1861, accompanied with an illustrative, piquant, and characteristic editorial.

The writer has been warned by many of his own friends, and by some of Horace Greeley's admirers, against the folly of provoking so powerful a newspaper editor. To the former, the writer has replied that there is a scriptural history about a shepherd boy, and a taunting, bragging, powerful giant ; and that even pebbles, *if* well chosen, and *if* well aimed, can do execution against a Goliah. To the latter class, the writer has answered, that although sensible, that like not a few other political, legal, and literary hacks, the writer resides in a three-story glass house ; yet the question is not and cannot become one concerning the obscure individual and *his* demerits, but remains about the Editor and public man, who, seeking to lead public sentiment, is amenable to its judgment. It is a naked question of exposing to history and posterity, for the good of real morality, a crying public abuse which existed in the past. This obscure *brochure* may be read and forgotten this year ; but placed, as it will be, in every public library in the land, will, in many years to come, serve the same universal good which the once obscure and trembling letter-writers of the Cromwellian or

Dantonian revolutions have served, in quietly noting for posterity the hypocrisies, vanities, and frivolities of some demi-god of a fanatical mob ; and in demonstrating that the patriotism of this demi-god was only a thin cloak that time rotted away.

The succeeding pages are believed to be entirely free from even a remote reference to any personal controversy between writer and subject. They are intended to be relieved from undignified allusions.

The pebbles may not be well chosen, and may not be well aimed. But they take their slender chances against the editorial giant, with his peculiar followers, of whom may be said (as was sung of those of Alp, the renegade, in Byron's *Siege of Corinth*) :

“ They crouched to him, for he had skill  
To *warp* and wield the public will.”

## LETTER, WITH NOTES.

---

MY DEAR HOXIE:—Among the editorials in *The Tribune* of the day succeeding the Mayoralty election, were conspicuously printed the words “POOR JOE!” (a)

They undoubtedly ‘made the unskillful laugh ;’ but they also ‘made the judicious grieve ;’ and (as Hamlet continues) ‘the censure of the which one must in your allowance outweigh a whole theatre of others.’

You had exercised your right of suffrage as a private citizen, by voting for a much respected and personal friend. Upon several days previously, you had, as a private citizen, also exercised your choice of electioneering. It happening that the vote and electioneering were not in accordance with the views of Horace Greeley, and your candidate being defeated, you were selected by him, from among the seventy-five thousand electors, to be (according to a phrase in Alexander Hamilton’s celebrated libel definition) ‘held up to public ridicule.’ Just as effectually so by the intention of those two words, as if a column had been used by Horace Greeley’s pen, which seems to boast to itself an editorial reign of terror over judges, prosecutors and jurymen ; and therefore laughs to scorn the consequences of libel at which, under similar circumstances, a poor country editor might justly tremble. (b)

---

NOTE (a). These words were inserted among the editorial rejoicings over the election of the Tribune candidate. They were unattended by any other sentence, and formed a single paragraph. Consequently the one upon which a reader’s eye most readily centred in opening the paper.

NOTE (b). Mr. Joseph Hoxie had known C. Godfrey Gunther, Esq. [the candidate of one of the Union, as well as Tammany and German League, candidates for Mayor], from the latter’s boyhood. Horace Greeley sought to force him in December into a *party* support ; although in November Horace Greeley had openly bolted two party candidates. Mr. Hoxie doubtless remembered the following editorial of Horace Greeley. [The *animus* of 1861 and of 1858 are particularly worthy of juxtaposition.]

When the paper containing the words was shown to me, I was instantly reminded of a conversation between us during our recent joint canvass. You jokingly alluded to Horace Greeley's attacks upon several candidates (who had at various times thwarted Horace Greeley's ambitions or political interests). I think *my* words were : "Your time will also come, Hoxie, for you are not forgiven the small amount of time and money you expended last February, at Albany, in doing for Horace Greeley as a candidate for U. S. Senator, (c) that which was only criminal when against him or his

---

position. The New York public can be as independent as they please when Horace Greeley has no pet candidate ; but when he has, then cracks his idiosyncratic whip :]

"One thing has been settled by the experience of the last twenty years, and that is the moral impossibility of good Municipal rule under the sway of any political party. Either the citizens who mainly pay the taxes must come together and resolve to unite, without distinction of party, in the support of honest, capable men for responsible places in the municipality, or they must submit to be ruled by speculators and sharers leagued with miscreants and ruffians. There is just this choice open to them. True, we might urge that none of the great cities, Chicago alone excepted, have yet been ruled by the Republicans as a party ; and that they ought to be tried before party municipal government is decisively pronounced a failure ; but it is wiser to rest on the abundant experience afforded by the failures of all other parties. Years ago, we were satisfied that no party which had a President to support or to elect could ever govern a great city wisely, efficiently, or economically. *We have for the last four or five years supported and opposed candidates for Municipal stations regardless of their politics, AND MEAN TO DO SO EVERMORE.*

"Our City now holds her Municipal separate from our State and National elections ; so do all, or nearly all, other great cities. *Let the divorce of Municipal affairs from Politics be made absolute and universal*, and we may hope henceforth to avoid the reign of Vigilance Committees on the one hand, and of Ballot-box Stuffers on the other."

This editorial from the *Tribune* of June 8, 1858, was a complete justification of the course of Mr. Hoxie (a Republican), supporting Mr. Gunther (a Democrat), and a valued friend.

NOTE (c). It is interesting to the student of human motive to study Horace Greeley's files from February, 1861—the date of the New York Senatorial election, when Horace Greeley was defeated—in order to see how those who then voted, or those who lobbied against his aspirations have been guillotined in his Spruce street sanctum. Comptroller Haws (one of the most scrupulously industrious, honest, and high-minded men of the land) was always spoken of by Horace Greeley as he deserved, *down* to the time of the fatal (?) visit to Albany, against the Senatorial aspirant. The

favorite men—"lobbying.'" You dissented, and thought Horace Greeley would never tread upon the friendships and other favors of twenty years, to indulge in a libel upon you.

reader will find among Horace Greeley's files, since that time, many references to a Haws-ian fall from grace, that, however, no one else but Horace Greeley has noticed. Mr. Washington Smith, ex-Governor of the Alms-House, &c., &c., just before the Senatorial election, gave a supper party (being one of the Presidential electors), at which was present William M. Evarts, Esq.—the Senatorial candidate who withdrew in favor of Ira Harris (the balance-of-power candidate), and elected him—and at which supper was *not* present Horace Greeley. Mr. Evarts made a pleasant speech, and was toasted by Washington Smith as the next U. S. Senator. Last November, Washington Smith was nominated regularly by the Republican party for the State Senate. But Horace Greeley, "didn't see it." A Union Republican was started by Horace Greeley, and Washington Smith was not elected. In the summer of 1861, William M. Evarts, Esq., delivered an agricultural address in the interior of New York State. All other editors praised it, *but the correspondent of Horace Greeley averred that it was too long, and was not in any sense an agricultural address!* Doubtless other *circumstances* will occur to readers, and which to mention space forbids.

NOTE (d). This remarkable epistle is as follows—the italics being of the writer:

NEW YORK, Saturday eve., Nov. 11, 1854.

Gov. SEWARD: The Election is over, and its results sufficiently ascertained. It seems to me a fitting time to announce to you the dissolution of the political firm of **SEWARD, WEED and GREELEY**, by the withdrawal of the junior partner—said withdrawal to take effect on the morning after the first Tuesday in February next. And, as it may seem a great presumption in me to assume that any such firm exists, especially since the public was advised, rather more than a year ago, by an Editorial rescript in the *Evening Journal*, formally reading me out of the Whig party, that I was esteemed no longer either useful or ornamental in the concern, you will, I am sure, indulge me in some reminiscences which seem to befit the occasion.

I was a poor young printer, and editor of a Literary Journal—a very active AND BITTER Whig in a small way, but not seeking to be known out of my own Ward Committee—when, after the great political revulsion of 1837, I was one day called to the City Hotel, where two strangers introduced themselves as THURLOW WEED and LEWIS BENEDICT, of Albany. They told me that a cheap Campaign Paper of a peculiar stamp at Albany had been resolved on, and that I had been selected to edit it. The announcement might well be deemed flattering by one who had never even sought the notice of the great, and who was not known as a partisan writer, and I EAGERLY embraced their proposals. They asked me to fix my salary for the year; I named \$1,000, which they agreed to: and I did the work required to the best of my ability. It was work that made no figure and created no sensation; but I loved it *and did it well*. When it was done, you were Governor, dispensing

But the younger prophet, my dear Hoxie, proves most correct. Those friendships were wiped from Horace Greeley's newspaper slate as remorselessly as a Thug throttles his traveling companion.

(Let me chronicle an honorable difference. A playful allusion to your candidate's defeat appeared in *The Evening Post* of the same

---

offices worth \$3,000 to \$20,000 per year to your friends and compatriots, AND I returned to my garret and my crust, and my desperate battle with pecuniary obligations heaped upon me by bad partners in business and the disastrous events of 1837. *I believe it did not then occur to me that some of these abundant places might have been offered to me without injustice*; I now think it should have occurred to you. If it did occur to me, I was not the man to ask you for it; I think that should not have been necessary. I only remember that no friend at Albany inquired as to my pecuniary circumstances; that your friend (but not mine), ROBERT C. WETMORE, was one of the chief dispensers of your patronage here; and that such devoted compatriots as A. H. WELLS and JOHN HOOKS were lifted by you out of pauperism into independence, as I am glad I was not; and yet an inquiry from you as to my needs and means at that time would have been timely, and held ever in grateful remembrance.

In the HARRISON campaign of 1840, I was again designated to edit a campaign paper. I published it as well, and ought to have made something by it, in spite of its extremely low price; my extreme poverty was the main reason why I did not. It compelled me to hire press-work, mailing, &c., done by the job, and high charges for extra work nearly ate me up. At the close, I was still without property and in debt, but this paper had rather improved my position.

Now came the great scramble of the swell mob of coon minstrels and cider suckers at Washington—I not being counted in. Several regiments of them went on from this city; but no one of the whole crowd—though I say it who should not—had done so much toward Gen. HARRISON's nomination and election as yours respectfully. *I asked nothing, expected nothing; but you, Gov. SEWARD, ought to have asked that I be POSTMASTER OF NEW YORK.* Your asking would have been in vain; but it would have been an act of grace neither wasted nor undeserved.

I soon after started *The Tribune*, because I was urged to do so by certain of your friends, and because such a paper was needed here. I was promised certain pecuniary aid in so doing; it might have been given me without cost or risk to any one. All I ever had was a loan by piecemeal of \$1,000, from James Coggeshall. God bless his honored memory! I did not ask for this, and I think it is the one sole case in which I ever received a pecuniary favor from a political associate. I am very thankful that he did not die till it was fully repaid.

And let me here honor one grateful recollection. When the Whig party under your rule had offices to give, *my name was never thought of*; but when, in '42-3, we were hopelessly out of power, I was honored with the nomination for State Printer. When we came again to have a State Printer to elect as well as nominate, the place went to WEED, as it ought. Yet it was worth something to know that there was

day. That paper being edited by a poet and a critic—men who cherish gentlemanly instincts, and are sought after in social life, from which clodhoppers are excluded—apologized, the next evening, for the allusion to yourself, and in a manner so happy and eulogistic, that I dare say you did not regret the original article. But no re-

---

once a time when it was not deemed too great a sacrifice to recognize me as belonging to your household. *If a new office had not since been erected on purpose to give its valuable patronage to H. J. RAYMOND, and enable ST. JOHN to show forth his Times, as the organ of the Whig State Administration, I should have been still more grateful.*

In 1848 your star again rose, and my warmest hopes were realized in your election to the Senate. I was no longer needy, and had no more claim than desire to be recognized by Gen. TAYLOR. I think I had some claim to forbearance from you. What I received thereupon was a most humiliating lecture in the shape of a decision in the libel case of REDFIELD and PRINGLE, and an obligation to publish it in my own and the other journal of our supposed firm. I thought, and still think, this lecture needlessly cruel and mortifying. The plaintiffs, after using my columns to the extent of their needs or desires, stopped writing and called on me for the name of their assailant. I proffered it to them—a thoroughly responsible name. They refused to accept it, unless it should prove to be one of the four or five first men in Batavia!—when they had known from the first who it was, and that it was neither of them. They would not accept that which they had demanded: they sued me instead for money, and money you were at liberty to give to them to their heart's content. I do not think you *were* at liberty to humiliate me in the eyes of my own and your<sup>2</sup> public as you did. I think you exalted your own judicial sternness and fearlessness unduly at my expense. I think you had a better occasion for the display of these qualities when WEBB threw himself entirely upon you for a pardon which he had done all a man could do to demerit. (His paper is paying you for it now.)

I have publicly set forth my view of your and our duty with respect to Fusion, Nebraska and party designations. I will not repeat any of that. I have referred also to WEED's leading me out of the Whig party—my crime being, in this as in some other things, that of doing to-day what more politic persons will not be ready to do till to-morrow.

Let me speak of the late canvass. *I was once sent to Congress for ninety days, merely to enable JIM BROOKS to secure a seat therein for four years. I think I never hinted to any human being that I would have liked to be put forward for any place.* But JAMES W. WHITE† (you hardly know how good and true a man he is) started my name for Congress, and BROOKS' packed delegation thought I could help him through; so I

---

\* If I am not mistaken, this judgment is the only speech, letter or document addressed to the public in which you ever recognized my existence. I hope I may not go down to posterity as embalmed therein.

† (Note by the writer.) Now Judge Superior Court, and every way worthy of this allusion.

gret has been expressed by Horace Greeley for the insult to his old friend, and to the daughters, sons, and family associates of that old friend !)

But to even such a cloud there is a silver lining. The two words of insult to you have done much more to enlighten the peculiar admirers of Horace Greeley, as to his editorial vindictiveness and

---

was put on *behind* him. But this last Spring, after the Nebraska question had created a new state of things at the North, one or two personal friends, of no political consideration, suggested my name as a candidate for Governor, and I did not discourage them. Soon, the persons who were afterward mainly instrumental in nominating CLARK came about me, and asked if I could secure the Know Nothing vote. I told them I neither could nor would touch it; on the contrary, I loathed and repelled it. Thereupon they turned upon CLARK.

I said nothing, did nothing. A hundred people asked me who should be run for Governor. I sometimes indicated PATTERSON; I never hinted at my own name. But by-and-by WEED came down, and called me to him, to tell me why he could not support me for Governor. (I had never asked nor counted on his support.)

I am sure WEED did not mean to humiliate me; *but he did it.* The upshot of his discourse (very cautiously stated) was this: If I were a candidate for Governor, I should beat not myself only, but you. Perhaps that was true. But as I had in no manner solicited his or your support, I thought this might have been said to my friends rather than to me. I suspect it is true that I could not have been elected Governor as a Whig. But had he and you been favorable, there would have been a party in the State ere this which could and would have elected me to any post, without injuring itself or endangering your re-election.

It was in vain that I urged that I had in no manner asked a nomination. At length I was nettled by his language—well intended, but *very* cutting as addressed by him to me—to say, *in substance*, “Well, then, make PATTERSON Governor, and *try my name for Lieutenant.* To lose this place is a matter of no importance; and we can see whether I am really so odious.”

I should have hated to serve as Lieutenant-Governor, but I should have gloried in running for the post. I want to have my enemies all upon me at once; I am tired of fighting them piecemeal. And, though I should have been beaten in the canvass, I know that my running would have helped the ticket, AND HELPED MY PAPER.

It was thought best to let the matter take another course. No other name could have been put on the ticket so bitterly humbling to me as that which was selected. The nomination was given to RAYMOND; the fight left to me. And Gov. SEWARD, *I have made it*, though it be conceded in me to say so. What little fight there has been, I have stirred up. Even WEED has not been (I speak of his paper) hearty in this contest, while the journal of the Whig Lieut.-Governor has taken care of its own interests, and let the canvass take care of itself, as it early declared

political hypocrisy, than did even his celebrated epistle to Senator Seward, in which he deprecated his loss of a nomination for Lieutenant-Governor, because it also lost him an occasion "*to help my paper!*" (d)

it would do. That journal has (because of its milk-and-water course) some twenty thousand subscribers in this city and its suburbs, and of these twenty thousand, I venture to say more voted for ULLMANN and SCROGGS, than for CLARK and RAYMOND; the *Tribune* (also because of its character) has but eight thousand subscribers within the same radius, and I venture to say that of its habitual readers, nine-tenths voted for CLARK and RAYMOND—very few for ULLMANN and SCROGGS. I had to bear the brunt of the contest, and take a terrible responsibility in order to prevent the Whigs uniting upon JAMES W. BARKER, to defeat FERNANDO WOOD.<sup>o</sup> Had BARKER been elected here, neither you nor I could walk these streets without being hooted, and Know-Nothingism would have swept like a prairie-fire. I stopped BARKER's election at the cost of incurring the deadliest enmity of the defeated gang: and I have been rebuked for it by the Lieut.-Governor's paper. At the critical moment, he came out against JOHN WHEELER, in favor of CHARLES H. MARSHALL (who would have been your deadliest enemy in the House), and even your Col.-General's paper, which was even with me in insisting that WHEELER should be returned, wheeled about, at the last moment, and went in for MARSHALL—the *Tribune* alone clinging to WHEELER to the last. I rejoice that they who turned so suddenly were not able to turn all their readers.

Gov. SEWARD, I know that some of your most cherished friends think me a great obstacle to your advancement—that JOHN SCHOOLCRAFT, for one, insists that you and WEED should not be identified with me. I trust, after a time, you will not be. I trust I shall never be found in opposition to you; I have no farther wish than to glide out of the newspaper world as quietly and as speedily as possible, join my family in Europe, and if possible stay there quite a time—long enough to cool my fevered brain and renovate my overtired energies. All I ask is that we shall be counted even on the morning after the first Tuesday in February, as aforesaid, and that I may thereafter take such course as seems best, without reference to the past.

You have done me acts of valued kindness in the line of your profession: let me close with the assurance that these will ever be gratefully† remembered by

Yours,

HORACE GREELEY.

Hon. WM. H. SEWARD, Present.

\* (Note by the writer.) Here, in 1854, he admits aiding the election of Mr. Wood—but ever afterward *any* person *suspected* of such an endeavor, has been most wantonly assailed by Horace Greeley.—See *Tribune* files, *passim*.

† Quere by present writer—CHICAGO?

Even Tom Pinch found out Pecksniff at last, and the few remaining idolators of Horace Greeley can read to advantage how it was that Tom discovered his deity to be a false one, if they will ponder over the thirty-first chapter of "Martin Chuzzlewit." (e)

Permit me to give you *my* explanation of why Horace Greeley thus singled you out for his ridicule from among 75,000 electors. *It was because you had offended his SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS.* (f)

NOTE (e). As one by one these idolators make some discovery which shakes their faith, they feel as Dickens thus describes: "And now the full agitation and misery of the disclosure came rushing upon Tom indeed. The star of his whole life from boyhood had become, in a moment, putrid vapor. It was not that Pecksniff—Tom's Pecksniff—had ceased to exist, but that he never had existed. In his death, Tom would have had the comfort of remembering what he used to be, but in this discovery he had the anguish of recollecting what he never was. For as Tom's blindness in this matter had been total and not partial, so was his restored sight. *His* Pecksniff could never have worked the wickedness of which he had just now heard, but any other Pecksniff could; and the Pecksniff who could do that, could do anything, and no doubt had been doing anything and everything, except the right thing, all through his career. From the lofty height on which poor Tom had placed his idol, it was tumbled down headlong, and

"Not all the king's horses, nor all the king's men,  
Could have set Mr. Pecksniff up again."

Legions of Titans couldn't have got him out of the mud."

Then it will be remembered that Pecksniff, listening unseen to the stunning soliloquy which followed from Tom Pinch, came to the conclusion to be beforehand, and publicly throw Pinch overboard. Just as Horace Greeley has thrown Webster, Seward, Campbell, Hunt, Weed, Raymond, McElrath, &c., &c., overboard, at the precise moment when *they* had severally turned him out of the gentlemen's cabin. And thus it was Pecksniff did it:

"I am glad he's gone," said old Martin Chuzzlewit, drawing a long breath, when Tom had left the room. "It is a relief," assented Mr. Pecksniff. "It is a great relief. *But having discharged—I hope, with tolerable firmness—the duty which I owed to society*, I will now, my dear sir, if you will give me leave, retire to shed a few tears in the back garden, *as an humble individual.*"

NOTE (f). "Self-consciousness"—'consciousness within one's self.'—Webster Dict. Used by Locke. Or a perpetual consciousness of one's self, sleeping or waking, above, beyond, and over every other object of perception and sensation. It is the very opposite of what is thus described by a writer in the February *Continental Magazine*: "The process described so philosophically by Coleridge, to lose 'self in an idea dearer than self,' is the condition of all greatness. It sublimated the life of Wash-

Horace Greeley is a man of strong will and vigorous thought. He is a rapid thinker, and a headlong writer. He possesses native genius; but it has contracted two chronic mental diseases, that increase in "illness" with his years. One is a morbid self-consciousness—worse than that of Narcissus (*g*) (whom, in justice to the world, the gods speedily sent to Hades). The other disease is a villager's fondness for hearing and retailing gossip, conjoined with a proneness to intermeddling! Instead of being obliged (as all mortals similarly afflicted are obliged) to run out and exercise his self-consciousness from pillar to post, or to pick up and repeat his gossip, and enact his intermeddling around the world, Horace Greeley has a newspaper, which is his glass to reflect self-consciousness in—his viaduct of gossip and his engine of intermeddling.

*This extraordinary self-consciousness destroys his fidelity to friends, his magnanimity to enemies, his devotion to country, and his regard for social tranquillity.*

For a long time it was skillfully concealed by a claim of public spirit. But what is it Sir William Draper, in his second letter to Junius, said? "Disappointed ambition, resentment for defeated hopes, and desire of revenge, assume but too often the appearance of public spirit."

When Horace Greeley edited *The New Yorker*, this self-consciousness was germinating. But when Diogenes (as I once heard you remark on the stump) gets out of the tub, he is generally a dif-

---

ington, and made it unique in the annals of nations; it enabled Shakspere to incarnate the elements of humanity in dramatic creations, and Kean to reproduce them on the stage; it is the grand law of the highest achievements in statesmanship, in letters, and in art; without which they fall short of wide significance and enduring vitality."

NOTE (*g*). A friendly critic asks: "Why 'lug in' Narcissus? he has nothing to do with it!" Let us refer to the story then. Narcissus was the son of Lyrope, a nymph of the ocean. The nymphs of the *mountains* beheld him with admiration. Beauteous *Echo* fell in love with him. He treated them and her with scorn and contempt. The goddess Rhamnusia granted their prayer that *he* should, for punishment, continually desire what he should never be able to obtain. Narcissus, happening to look into the smooth and transparent water of a fountain, became enamored of his own beautiful person. *Day by day* he returned to the fountain to behold the object of his admiration. He looked and loved incessantly. Sometimes

ferent philosopher from the one who was under the bunghole ! The self-consciousness was only developed when the business sagacity of Thomas McElrath had furnished brecze and string for the Horace Greeley kite, and *The Tribune* soared into the lower clouds of popular favor, and invited men's attention. Mr. McElrath being modest, and Horace Greeley otherwise, that attention centred on the latter. Diogenes then emerged from his tub ! And his editorials began to be, what they have always continued to be, conceived in the words of Gratiano, "I am Sir Oracle, and when *I* ope my lips let no dog bark."

Soon fancying the results of his self-consciousness to be as palatable to the public as they were to himself, he attempted to make a republic of Horace Greeleys, peopled by his readers. It was not a fashion of diet or of dress he would set (as lower-order mortals did) but one of morals and politics. Horace Greeley endeavored to construct with his editorial pen a republic of Phalanxers and free-lovers, amateur farmers and strong-minded women. But the shrewd hand of Thomas McElrath pulled the curb, and the "H. G."

---

he attempted to kiss the beauteous figure, but only drenched his nostrils. Sometimes he plunged into the water—*always disappointed*. Wearied, at length, with grief and disappointment, he abandoned himself to despair, and the gods sent him to Hades. The shades in the region of Pluto were often surprised by the ghost of Narcissus bending over the gloomy waters of the Styx, searching for the earthly idol.

In an apartment adjoining the Sala degli Animali, in the Museo Pio Clementino, at Rome, among the fine collection of statues is one of Narcissus. Of this figure Sir J. L. Smith observes : "He has a very foolish face, which, perhaps, he ought."

Here is a Narcissus reflection from the Washington fountain. In the *Tribune* of January 4, 1861, appears this *telegram* conspicuously among the war news :

"MR. GREELEY'S LECTURE.

"Horace Greeley delivered a lecture to-night *before a dense auditory* at the Smithsonian Institution, his subject being 'The Nation.' He said the misfortune of our country had been its reluctance to meet its antagonist in the eye. Slavery is the aggressor, and has earned a rebel's doom. Save the Union, and let Slavery take its chance. He was against compromise, because it implied concession to armed treason ; and expressed his belief, that the present contest would result in enduring benefits to the cause of human freedom. *President Lincoln, Secretary Chase, and several Senators and Representatives were on the platform.* THE LECTURER WAS FREQUENTLY APPLAUSED."

The italics are the writer's. Was the telegram written and paid for by some mountain nymph or 'Echo' ?

steed ambled off into the race-course of personal politics. It entered for the Epsom cup (which turned out full of Epsom salts) of Congressships, and Gubernatorial, Senatorial and Ambassadorial dignities. There was erected a grand stand for those who betted upon each aspiration. They who took the field against the favorite, were placed behind the ropes and pummeled, or detained over night in Greeley-ian cells ! (h)

Public questions and private quarrels were treated of in Horace Greeley's editorials in a manner best calculated to make them subsidiary to the triumphs of this self-consciousness. The editorials admitted no possibility of error, and were without qualification of fact or doubt of logic. There were no "peradventures," nor "if-we-are-not-mistakens." They were of the Sir Oracle, dogmatic, assertional school of rhetoric. (i)

Did a Congressman voyage counter to H. G. breezes—"Off with his head, so much for Buckingham!" was heard from behind the scenes. (j) Did the Chief Justice of a State or of the

---

NOTE (h). Again refer to the letter to Seward, and this allusion will be more understood.

NOTE (i). "With purpose to be dressed in an opinion  
Of wisdom, gravity, profound conceit."

*Gratiano*—MERCHANT OF VENICE.

NOTE (j). A rural neighbor of Horace Greeley, and his friend—the Hon. John B. Haskin, M. C.—was thus (Jan. 8th, 1858, *Tribune*) treated for running counter, &c. : "Mr. Haskin, of the Westchester District, in this State, in the debate in the House on Wednesday, at Washington, very boldly condemned the fillibustering of Walker, but more boldly declared in favor of fillibustering on a large scale. Mr. Haskin, according to our telegraphic report, despises the petit larceny of individuals, but glories in the 'grand larceny of nations'; and accordingly he is for stealing Cuba by all the power of the Government. Mr. Haskin's private morals are of no public consequence whatever; but we recommend him to observe some degree of reticence in his public utterances. It is of no service to anybody to boast of villainy; and the man who does it not only discloses his want of virtue, but his want of sense. A knave in disguise is offensive enough, but a confessing knave is worse. We recognize a lurking sense of decency in hypocritical professions of goodness, but toward blatant rascality there can be no sentiments but those of disgust. Mr. Haskin will find himself unable to get on in the course he has chosen. We recommend him to the confessional. Let him come out and admit that he has made a fool of himself, and begin again."

United States think differently from the H. G. groove of thought—presto ! he was editorially written down an ass. (*k*) And as self-consciousness is a contagious disease, it extended to many of Horace Greeley's staff. Did an actor nod coldly to a certain theatrical critic—up went the ink-bottle at the actor's whole repertoire. (*l*) Did a judge infringe upon the crude legal ideas of a certain bar reporter, the same missle spotted his ermine. (*m*) Did a

---

Mr. Haskin did not confess he was a fool, but, like a sensible man, went on in his own course; “being one of the unterrified” Democracy. But in two months his private morals and public worth underwent a change, because H. G. found him *supporting* an H. G. policy. In the *Tribune* of March 13th, 1858, Horace Greeley thus writes:

“ We make room this morning for the recent speech of the Hon. John B. Haskin of this State, against the attempt of the President and the Southern members of Congress to force the Lecompton Constitution upon the people of Kansas. This speech was delivered in the House of Representatives on Wednesday last, and, according to the testimony of all beholders, was listened to with extraordinary attention. This was but natural. It is a bold and manly speech, such as many a Northern craven, who now truckles and yields in Congress, will hereafter wish he had made in this great historical crisis. Of course, when we say this, we do not mean to be understood as adopting and approving every word and sentiment which this speech contains. There are ideas and expressions in it with which we never shall agree. Mr. Haskin has always been a Hard-Shell Democrat, and speaks as such. Would to God his words of wisdom and of warning might be heeded by the South, in whose behalf he has fought many a political battle, and to which he has given every honorable pledge of fidelity ! It is indeed surprising, when such men as Haskin and Douglas, Walker, Stanton, and Wise rise in resistance to such a measure as this Lecompton fraud, that other leaders of the Democratic party should still be so infatuated as to force it upon the country. Is theirs anything but the madness which precedes destruction ? ”

The writer particularly remembered these two editorials, from their manufacturing THREE ‘*Tom Pinches*’ within the writer's notice.

NOTE (*k*). The editorials on Chief Justice Taney, about the Dred Scott decision, will be so particularly remembered for their exceedingly graceful language (!) that quotations would be wearisome.

NOTE (*l*). The same will be remembered of the articles upon Edwin Forrest. So late as December, 1860, his *Boston* engagement was referred to in a manner as peculiar as the early one. The editorial pen traveled to *Boston* after the opportunity.

NOTE (*m*). Here is a characteristic selection. Judge Daly had trodden on H. G.'s.

leading author refuse his homage to the household critic—"Anathema" was inscribed upon his volume on the H. G. shelf, and

---

temperance corns. Judge Charles P. Daly, of the New York Common Pleas, had then been over fifteen years on the Bench. He is widely known as a philosophic student and writer, and as a jurist, on or off the Bench. (*Vide* his preface to E. D. Smith's Reports, his article on Naturalization, in the Appleton Cyclopaedia, and his recent bold, manly, and logical letter to Senator Harris, on the privateersmen.) In private life he is even more esteemed than in public: and yet, in the *Tribune* of May 28, 1858, appeared the following H. G. editorial, holding the Judge up to insult:

"Judge Daly lately tried a case in our city, involving mainly this question—'Is lager beer an intoxicating liquor?'—on which point he gave a *hazy*, and *inconsequent* charge, or *opinion*, savoring *far more* of *lager* than of common sense or logic. The conclusion which he rather indicated than attained was, that lager is *not* intoxicating, which is about like asserting that small-pox is not a fatal disease. There is probably not one in ten of the persons in Court, when this opinion was delivered, whom a liberal supply of lager would not render stupidly, senselessly drunk; and the fact that there were a few 'old soakers' introduced as witnesses, who swore that they had drunk gallons of it without losing the use of their limbs or their faculties, only proves that certain human constitutions are naturally tough, while others become indurated by constant exposure to injurious influences. Mithridates, it is said, from fear of poisons, accustomed himself to their use—at first, in minute quantities; but these he increased, until he took, with little apparent harm, doses, that would have speedily killed persons unhabituated to such potions. Cases akin to, though hardly so striking as this, abound; and, if the Judge's ruling, with reference to lager, is sound, it would follow from his premises that no such thing as a poison is known."

In the *Tribune* of April 23, 1858, appears another of these articles from the pen of H. G. Talk of the elective judiciary ruining the country, when the Bench, high and low, is continually depreciated by Horace Greeley!

"The Hon. Judge Thompson of our [one-horse] Marine Court, in ruling, last week, the case of Maria Jenkins against Thaddeus L. Lewis—being a suit of a colored woman against a conductor for thrusting her out of a car on the Sixth Avenue Railroad—is reported to have affirmed these points:

"'That negroes do not possess the same rights and privileges as white men; remarking that the Dred Scott decision was not only sound law, and should be obeyed by every good citizen of the community, but that it was founded on principles of justice, reason, and Christianity. That the plaintiff, being a negro, had no right to a seat in the car in question; that it was the duty of the conductor to expel her, under the rules and regulations of the Company; that the Company had the right to establish such rules and regulations; that negroes might be permitted, but were not entitled to a seat in a public conveyance. That the only question for the jury to consider was whether the defendant used any more force than was necessary to put the plaintiff off the cars.'

even his publishers maligned. (n) Did a statesman differ from H. G. policy—his years of scholarship and patriotism were placed at the Joe Miller mercy of the last smart young man from Boston. (o) So that the *Tribune* readers often saw reflected in the newspaper, not plain facts and sound logic, but the idiosyncrasies, prejudices and likes of Horace Greeley and his peculiar portion of the newspaper staff.

Suppose, my dear Hoxie, that every member of society afflicted with the disease of self-consciousness, had a newspaper at his hand—to think aloud in at all times of the day and night ; in moods bilious, phlegmatic, saturnine, sanguine ; before breakfast and after breakfast ; when domestic roads were rough or macadamized ; when hopes were high or low ; when selfishness flew easterly or diablerie puffed southerly, &c., &c.—in short, pouring the crudities of rapid thought into the columns of a newspaper *a la Horace Greeley*, and not first sifting them with reflective labor ? Why, there would be a confederation of Kilkenny-cat States, presided over by some disappointed philosopher !

Next of the gossip disease.

Horace Greeley is a victim to curiosity. His private sanctum yearly witnesses a constant procession of gossips or “needy knife-

---

“ With all deference to the inscrutable wisdom of a judge—of the Marine Court, especially—putting our hand on our mouth and our mouth in the dust, we venture timidly to suggest that, assuming the fundamental positions, above laid down, to be true (as who shall dare to question such a decision from such a quarter?) the Judge came short of his duty in condescending to listen to the suit of Maria Jenkins at all. Was not that point expressly made in the Dred Scott case, that Dred, being a mere nigger, had no right to sue a man—of course, we mean a white man—and bring him into court at all ?”

In *Tribune*, June 1, 1858, is the following :

“ The Court of Common Pleas has reversed two judgments against the city, granted in that one-horse institution known as the Marine Court. There have been dozens of just such judgments given in Ward Courts and other low places, which ought to be set right by some responsible legal tribunal.”

NOTE (n). Literary men and publishers can readily recall scores of instances.

NOTE (o). The most striking instances will be the articles on Edward Everett, holding him up to ridicule in all possible ways, because he was a “ Union saver.”

grinders," or an avalanche of hearsay communications—retailing rumors, impressions, scandals, opinions, guesses, &c., &c. Horace Greeley pours these into his alembic or worm-still or retort (or whatsoever you may choose to call it), and the next-morning readers have the benefit of the first-proof distillations. For, credulous himself, he believes in them all, and drinks them smilingly. This is not wonderful, you may say, *since he so supremely believes in himself.*

Necessarily there follow modifications, or amplifications, or corrections in after issues of the paper, as the new set of rumor-mongers or incensed friends rush into the line of the rapid procession toward the shrine of gossip. (*p*) So that an ingenious European

---

**NOTE (p).** In the *Tribune*, May 8, 1858, appears the following (which may also be taken in connection with the references to the Bench, before given):

"It would seem, from the official acts of the two ornaments of the Bench, who preside over our local Criminal Court, Recorder Barnard and Judge Russell, that law is at the most only a matter of opinion, to be warped and twisted just as the humor of the Bench may happen to rule the hour. The Mayor, with praiseworthy care for the public welfare, has recently directed the arrest of certain gamblers; but in the beginning of the good work, he is met by the indecent interference of a night-wandering Police Justice. However, he succeeded in getting a few of the arrested parties before Recorder Barnard, where a charge of gambling was made against one, at least, who is everywhere known to be the proprietor of a gambling-house. Ex-Recorder Smith, who, since retiring from the Bench, seems to be the standing counsel for every gambler who gets into difficulty, appeared on this occasion, and so managed the cross-examination, that Barnard discharged this man, and all others brought up on similar complaints. He also volunteered the opinion that these arrests were illegal; to which the ex-Recorder assented, adding that, had the officers been shot while making these arrests, the homicides could not have been punished for killing them."

*This is a conspicuous editorial! One week later, May 15, in small type, appears the following "modification":*

"Upon more particular inquiry in regard to the recent foray upon gambling houses, we find that the primary and essential formality of a complaint, under oath, by two responsible citizens, had not been made against any one of the houses visited, nor had the next indispensable step—a written order from a Commissioner of Police—been observed. The officers seem to have gone to work on their own account, more with a view of frightening than of really arresting men suspected of gambling. Consequently, when called upon to make the required legal complaints, they had neither the data nor the disposition to proceed. In the absence of warrants under the old statutes and of the required formalities under the Police

friend, after perusing (among the curiosities of the Historical Library) some files of the *Tribune*, remarked : "A person should read it only every other day. Yet he must take care to start rightly. If he began on a thinking-aloud morning or a first-blush rumor day, and skipped the days of after thoughts, or modifications,

---

act, the Recorder had no alternative but to discharge the parties unconditionally. Having believed, from the tenor of the proceedings, that all due preliminaries had been observed, we could not understand this unexpected discharge ; but the facts above stated place the matter in a different light, and exonerate the Recorder from any responsibility for this one more of many failures in attempting to repress one of the worst vices of the city."

Of the thousands who read and believed the primary reckless statement, how many dozens saw the "modification" ?

In the *Tribune* of May 24, 1858, is the following :

"Archbishop HUGHES explicitly and indignantly denies the story of a secret Roman Catholic organization for the propagation and defense of that Church, which we copied last week from *The Albany Statesman*. We have no doubt of the truth of this denial. *We published The Statesman's story as a part of the gossip of the day, believing that it would be refuted if, as seemed highly probable, it was a fabrication.* And where an issue is made between an anonymous assailant and a well-known respondent, there should never be any hesitation as to crediting the man without a mask."

Those who remember the atrocious libel on the venerable Prelate, which is thus flippantly referred to, will not need to "make a note on't."

To show furthermore, that Horace Greeley does not spare sect, here is another extract :

"We are reliably assured that the Rev. Dr. Adams, of our city, is now maturing, in concert with some other learned and influential divines, mainly connected with the American Bible Society, plans for a revision of the Received Version which shall leave the words baptize, &c., as they are," &c.—*Tribune, May 10, 1858.*

This was in a conspicuous editorial. In the *Tribune* of next day, in small type, *fifth* page, (no attention called to it !) appears the following letter from the clergyman assailed :

"To the Editor of the New York Tribune :

"SIR : Judge of my astonishment on reading the following item of intelligence in your paper of this date :

" 'We are reliably assured that the Rev. Dr. Adams, of our city, is now maturing, in concert with some other learned and influential divines, mainly connected with the American Bible Society, plans for a revision of the Received Version which shall leave the words *baptize*, &c., as they are (or, as the Baptists say, untranslated)—the Baptist version now in progress giving "immerse," "immersing," for "baptize,"'

or corrected rumors, he was naturally a bewildered reader. But if he reversed the arrangement, he became measurably contented with *Tribune* views—especially if he read another daily paper as an alternative."

The meddlesome disease leads Horace Greeley towards threats and dictations. He meddles, for example, with Federal, State and local legislation, as an individual and a partisan, (*q*) when the un-

---

"baptizing," &c. Our informant may have blended, in some degree, his inferences with his facts; but there can be little doubt,' &c.

"This is the first information I have ever received of this important fact. Your informant certainly *has* 'blended his inferences with his facts,' and his facts with his imaginations. There is not a 'shadow of truth' in what is here affirmed in connection with my name.

"The RECEIVED VERSION of the Bible is good enough for me, and the following passage in it needs no 'revision': 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.'

WILLIAM ADAMS.

"*Madison-square Church*, May 10, 1858."

The last sentence is capital! So much for the illustrations of the gossip disease.

NOTE (*q*). Horace Greeley permits no one to advise with the Legislature or Congress unless through his paper. The most legitimate way of influencing a legislative body is thus well stated in a speech of the Hon. Mr. Alvord, of the New York Assembly, January 21, 1862:

"In conclusion, permit me to remind the House, that it is part of the history of this State, that before all the committees of this Legislature there have been found, from time to time, men who stand as high as any in the State, in character and position, and appearing as counsel, advocating the cause of those by whom they have been employed, and receiving large amounts in payment for their services."

The writer has only room for three specimens of Horace Greeley's patent lobby articles. The italics tell their own story. The first and second are both from the *Tribune* of April 19, 1858—editorial type.

"Governor King has vetoed the bill authorizing the Harlem Railroad to run its cars by steam down to Thirty-second street (as at present), instead of using horse-power exclusively below Forty-second street, as is required by an ordinance of our Common Council. WE are inclined to approve this veto, although the end it subserves is a bad one. The distance between the two points indicated is mainly a tunnel," &c., &c.

"The Legislature has interpolated into the Annual Tax bill of our city, an item covering the payment of Mr. D. D. Conover's salary, and the salaries of his subordinates, as officers of the Street Department, during the pendency of the contest

thinking portion of the world deem him a public-spirited editor. When Horace Greeley is Speaker, Clerk, Chairman of Committee, lobby adviser, &c., &c., all legislation progresses swimmingly—in his newspaper. But if he burns his fingers (as meddlesome school-boys often do), he thinks all around him have similar blackened fingers. He *perpetually* “lobbies” with the outer world. Indeed, there is no greater lobbyer in the United States—although he is continually raising the hue and cry against others. A parliamentary lawyer in England or in this country who is employed to prepare or explain private bills to a Commons, Congressional, legislative or civic committee, must pack trunk, travel and lodge at hotels, to accomplish his employment. Horace Greeley is more fortunate. Seated in his editorial chair, he summons pen, ink, paper, printer’s devils, compositors, pressmen, news-boys and Federal mails to accomplish *his* lobbying.

Is there a Minnesota land grant to be helped ; a railroad charter in Iowa to be furthered ; a Greeleyite Speaker to be chosen at Washington ; an office-holder to be badgered into bringing his advertising patronage (“to help my paper”) lest his fees suffer ; an anti-Greeleyite Clerk to be slaughtered at Albany ; a Boston Mayor

---

between him and Charles Devlin—also of his legal expenses in contesting the claims of Devlin. If, as we understand, this item is simply permissory—that is, it simply *enables* our municipal authorities to pay Conover and his subordinates, if they see fit, without *requiring* them to do so—WE *have no sort of objection*. Mr. Conover and his associates have rendered the city a great service in exposing the wholesale villainies whereof the Street Department has been the arena, and we believe our taxpayers will gladly see them paid for this service. The work has been done—we believe well done—and the city has largely benefited by it : if so, the city should be willing to pay. But paying salaries to Mr. Conover and his subordinates, with fat fees to his lawyers—WE *shall want to think of this.*”

This is from the *Tribune* of February 22d, 1858 :

“The State of New York is blessed, by some inscrutable dispensation of Providence and the enlightened favor of the Irish groggeries of Buffalo, with a legislator named *Loring*, who, on Friday last, made a striking exhibition of his quality by moving in the Assembly the following preamble and resolution : (Here follows one about Kansas frauds, &c.)

“We have hitherto asked no favors of this Assembly, nor even of the Republican minority therein ; but we now ask and insist that this Buffalo libeler of men, whose names he is not worthy to utter, be compelled to make the investigation he here pretends to desire. His preamble is a tissue of calumnies which he had no business

to be overawed ; a Philadelphia Judge to be intimidated ; a Baltimore jury to be influenced ; or a New York Judge to be interested in ‘ my friend’s’ case ; or a pet scheme to be furthered at Trenton ; or a City Hall Councilman to be dragooned into voting a printing bill—*then* Horace Greeley’s pen editorially will do the necessary lobbying ; and all the more effectually because it is the livery of the public-spirited Horace Greeley wherein the lobby-devil subserves the private end. (r)

---

to put forth, unless he really purposed to press the investigation they seem to contemplate. As among those whom his accomplice of *The Atlas* declares to be specially aimed at in his libel, we demand that the investigation be had, and that it be most thorough. We demand that all the facts be elicited, and that the Assembly record its deliberate judgment thereon.”

NOTE (r). If any reader doubts these things, let him watch Horace Greeley’s editorials for a year to come.

The veteran editor of the Albany *Evening Journal* (responding editorially, September 21, 1861, to an editorial walk which Horace Greeley had recently taken in this livery) thus remarked :

“ It has been our duty and task, for nearly forty years, to raise money for elections. During more than half that time we did so in consultation and co-operation with MR. GREELEY.

“ But if we have sinned in this way, Mr. GREELEY ought not to ‘ cast the first stone.’ He has not always been fastidious in the use of money at elections, or in legislation. He knows how much it cost—and out of whose pockets the money came—to elect a Speaker in Congress ! He knows how he expected to be reimbursed. He knows for what purpose a \$1,000 check was handed to him. And he knows—as we believe—that while in this latter particular he was blameless—how easy it is to mystify and malign—how swiftly falsehood travels, and how tardily truth follows.”

The largest private caucus of moneyed men the writer ever attended (and convened to raise money for election purposes), was addressed by Horace Greeley. So eloquently did he plead for money for Pennsylvania, that after supper five thousand dollars was raised.

In this connection, if Horace Greeley wants to remember how *he* feels when charged, as he systematically and constantly charges public men, let him read his own editorial on the House Investigation Committee (Tariff Inquiry—*Tribune*, May 26, 1858), in which he defends himself against the oaths of two witnesses, charging him with peccadillo.

Here are instances of the recklessness of Horace Greeley toward private citizens :

When Horace Greeley emerged from the crisis of a brain fever in order to deny his complicity with the "On to Richmond" (s) *med-*

"*The Courier and Enquirer* thinks we speak too harshly of the eminent merchants and bankers who signed the call for the Lecompton Meeting at Tammany Hall. 'We do not question their motives,' says the *C. and E.* Nor do we, responds *The Tribune*. We do these gentlemen the justice to disbelieve them amateur lovers of villainy, upholding fraud and forgery from sheer love of those dubious operations. *We are quite sure that if* Messrs. Stewart Brown, Moses Taylor, Charles Aug. Davis, &c., *were not interested* in Ocean Steamers, Ocean Telegraphs, &c., for which they desire the continued patronage and bounty of the Government, *they could never have been induced* to sign this call.

"With us, fraud is fraud, forgery is forgery, and the attempt to fasten upon an all but unanimously resisting people a frame of government and set of rulers notoriously loathed by them, is a flagrant crime. So holding, we so act and speak, leaving others to do as they see fit."—*Tribune*, March 5, 1858.

"This exposition makes it manifest, that the question of the African slave-trade has two sides to it at the South, and shows that its opening depends entirely upon which of the two great Southern interests dominates in the Federal Government. If Mr. Buchanan's Administration should approve the project, we have no doubt that Messrs. Henry Grinnell, Matthew Morgan, J. H. Brower, John A. Dix, John Van Buren, Robt. J. Dillon, Moses Taylor, Watts Sherman, Charles A. Davis, Stewart Brown, and thirty-three hundred others, would voluntarily come forward to call a meeting at Tammany, to strengthen the hands of the President in that virtuous undertaking. Why not? The act would not be half so mean as the one they have just performed in this line, *for it would be dignified by the selfish purpose of promoting their own interests, at a period of uncommon commercial dearth.*"—*Tribune*, March 10, 1858.

NOTE (s).—Here is a *fac simile* of the startling editorial *kept in the H. G. column for weeks*; the one ever before Congressmen and politicians, when goaded themselves into goading Scott and Lincoln :

---

#### THE NATION'S WAR-CRY.

*Forward to Richmond! Forward to Richmond!*  
*The Rebel Congress must not be allowed to meet*  
*there on the 20th July! By that date the*  
*place must be held by the National Army!*

---

Let us appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. In his paper of June 11th, 1858, he thus wrote regarding a probable war with England :

"It is, perhaps, however, presuming a little too much on the disinterestedness, the purely public spirit, of our Congressional war-mongers, to imagine that the mere prospect of a dreadful scourge to the nation; a shock to the foundations of

*dling*, I at first thought it was an effort at moral courage and patriotism ; and so I said. But it has since become evident that it was the supreme self-consciousness which dictated the disclaimer ; and Horace Greeley's self-consciousness-disease, and its concomitant symptoms of gossip and meddling, must be held accountable for the Manassas massacre by every widow and orphan of last July. I think, my dear Hoxie, you and I, under the same circumstances, would have had respective brain fevers—but perhaps we should not have recovered so readily.

Is it not, therefore, evident that all the self-consciousness, growth of idiosyncrasy, dogmaticalness, gossipy irresolution of statement, meddlesome dealing with everything and everybody, will convert Horace Greeley's paper into a blundering and unreliable affair ? Your Editor, all the civilized world over, has become a thinking machine for society. Readers take their "what's-o'-clock" of public fact and popular logic from him. And Horace Greeley's peculiar public (*t*) (diminished one fifth by the Seward letter, another fifth by the Bull Run meddling, a third fifth by his recent covert sneers at that most loyal man, Abraham Lincoln—whom, by the way, he opposed for U. S. Senator, advocating Douglass) has come to discover that the Horace Greeley clock needs oiling and winding up too often, and goes too fast, for reliability, at a foreign and domestic crisis like the present. (*u*)

---

society ; changes for the worse in the character of our Government, bad as it is already : interruption or overthrow of private happiness, and misery and wretchedness in multiplied forms, would prove preponderant considerations with them when placed in the balance against the chance of political position for themselves. Let us, therefore, suggest to our aspirants for political eminence, that for ambitious civilians nothing can be more doubtful and hazardous than a war."

NOTE (*t*). The writer does not wish to be understood as asserting that the *Tribune* public is thus diminished. The writer knows nothing of the merits of the circulation question. Herein he is to speak, and does speak, of what he knows and reads about Horace Greeley. There is an obvious distinction between Horace Greeley's public and the *Tribune* public. Thousands who read the *Tribune* don't believe in Horace Greeley. If the paper were rid of him, it would be of more value to the stockholders, and if the whale had not thrown up Jonah, Jonah might have disemboweled the whale, for all his blubber and powers of spouting.

NOTE (*u*). Horace Greeley editorially, January 9, 1859, thus wrote his own shame and fate:

And so it was, my dear Hoxie, because you crossed Horace Greeley's meddlesome path, and became the victim of his gossip-procession, and wounded his self-consciousness, that you were gazetted as "Poor Joe;" and are added to the list in Horace Greeley's day-book of the debtors to be dunned whenever the wound gapes or rankles.

The veracious historian must some day indict this Greeleyian self-consciousness for many offenses. For its blasphemies ; (v) for

---

"Newspapers are (or ought to be) printed for the information and entertainment of the whole community ; but when they are made mere advocates of petty or even of ponderous private interests, the advertisers of personal schemes, and puffers of men, who, whether connected with them or not, have a large number of axes to grind, they must lose all independence, manliness, and, in fact, all substantial patronage. Their insolvency must come in time. Should they have employed upon them writers disposed to speak their minds, and indisposed to submit to dictation, they must lose those writers in time. The consequence must be shiftlessness, inequality of management, and frequent surrenders of the ghost."

NOTE (v). Lest this should seem a harsh word, here is the concluding paragraph in the *Tribune* of *Christmas Day*, 1861, in an H. G. editorial, on Treasury frauds :

"O for another Christ, with whip of (not very) small cords to scourge with Divine wrath the money-changers out of the Temple of Liberty, which they profane and pollute!"

To the clergymen, whom Horace Greeley boasts are his especial adulators, the writer commends the following collateral illustrations :

*From the Tribune of January 7, 1861.*

"DR. RAPHAELL'S BIBLE.

"The Rev. Dr. Raphall is a burning and a shining light in our New York Israel. As Senator Wade said of his co-religionist, Judah P. Benjamin, he is 'an Israelite with Egyptian principles.' On the President's Fast-day, he preached a sermon in the Greene-street Synagogue, wherein he demonstrated, to his own satisfaction, that Human Slavery is sanctioned by Divine law. Now, in so far as the Rev. Dr. assumed to quote and to expound the law of Moses, we let him pass, and proceed to the other branch of the subject. We quote from a report of his discourse as follows."

*From the Tribune, May 5, 1858.*

"We note considerable surprise expressed in the columns of our distant cotemporaries at the late vote of the School Officers of our Fourth Ward excluding the Bible from their Ward Schools. Our own notion is, that it was an act of justice to the Bible for which those who revere that book should be deeply grateful. About every fourth dwelling in the Fourth Ward is either a grog-shop, gaming-house or

its larcenies of reputation, grand and petit ; for its counterfeits of patriotism ; (w) for its forgeries on public virtue ; for its homicides

brothel ; many of them are two of these 'rolled into one,' and some are all three. At least half the voters of this Ward are residents of grog-shops, or brothels, or both ; and these 'institutions' are rather lower, filthier, and more revolting than similar dens almost anywhere else. There are about 2,000 legal voters in the Fourth Ward, and they polled 2,637 votes at our last election, of which Fernando Wood had 2,112. Of course, the Ward Officers elected are all zealous Wood men. If the great majority of the people of the Fourth Ward saw fit to live with any sort of respect to the precepts of the Bible, it would be very well to keep the Sacred Volume in their schools ; but, as the case is, they do well to kick it out. There is no other course among those which they are at all inclined to pursue which would do the Book so much credit."

*From the same, April 3, 1858.*

"The Legislature is worrying over a bill to restrict the present exemption (to the extent of \$1,500) of a clergyman's property from taxation to such clergymen as are in active clerical service. To which it is demurred that a worn-out, unemployed clergymen needs it more than one who has still a parish and a salary. Either of these suggestions is well enough ; but better than either would be a bill abolishing all exemptions of clergymen's property from taxation. Such exemption is wrong in principle and unfair in practice. Many a clergymen whose income is \$1,500 or over per annum now goes tax-free, while his farming, blacksmithing, shoemaking neighbors, whose income is not nearly so liberal, have to pay taxes on whatever property they may have, like anybody else. So long as our Constitution absurdly excluded clergymen from civil office, there was some plausibility in exempting these political eunuchs from taxation ; but that is happily dissipated by our Reformed Constitution. Clergymen may now be elected to any office, as is right ; now let them pay taxes just like other people."

NOTE (w.) "Counterfeits of patriotism."—It is generally agreed that if at the time (fall of Fort Sumter) when the two sections faced each other, there had not been already engendered such bitter personal feelings as had been for many years sedulously aroused by the *New Orleans Delta* or *Charleston Mercury*, on the part of the South, and by Horace Greeley's editorials in the North toward the South, a vast deal of the acerbity displayed from Norfolk to Galveston would not have existed. Whether Horace Greeley was reckless or designing in aiding this acerbity, history will unfold. Davis, Benjamin & Co. were conservative at times—so was Horace Greeley. In the *New York Tribune* of May 25, 1860, he wrote thus :

"To my mind, it was the imperative duty of the Convention to regard the triumph of the cause first, and the gratification of personal feelings or aspirations a long way afterward. I wished first of all to succeed ; *next, to strengthen and establish our struggling brethren in the border Slave States.* Close as many suppose the contest is destined to be, and doubtful as they may deem its issue, I would now

on Manassas plains ; for its treason in the early articles justifying

---

gladly give away the ten sure votes of Rhode Island and Connecticut to gain the nine votes of Missouri."

This was, on its face, manly talk. If repeated during February, 1861, it would have proved valuable. There was *need* of such talk at this last date. Instead of which, his editorials were full of these expressions respecting the Peace Congress—"The Old Gentlemen's Conference"—"The Volunteer Convention, irreverently styled the One-horse Congress" (February 26, 1861). It was of great importance to establish our struggling brethren in the border Slave States—*then*. But Horace Greeley had been found in times of such need—during the Kansas-Nebraska-Lecompton debate—feeding the angry flames of the South, instead of quenching them. He took every pains to foster the jealousy with which Southerners were taught by *their* designing disunionists to regard matters literary, theological, and political at the North, wherein slavery was mentioned. True, the Republican party denounced the institution, and exposed its enormities, but *only* to illustrate the inexpediency of converting it from a local into a national institution. The first Republican Convention was presided over by a slaveholder. Nevertheless, in every way Horace Greeley abused the Southern States, people, and peculiarities : while at the same time he was compelled to admit the right of the South to govern their local institutions in its own way. It was as unmanly so to do, and as injurious to the argument, as it would be for a debater to attack the objectionable hat or the eccentric coat, or the affected drawl, or the taste of keeping goats in a bath-tub, possessed by his opponent.

From a Greeley editorial of June 11, 1858, is extracted the following—a very *mild* sample, too :

"If the statements of *The Richmond Whig* are to be taken as authority—and surely at this point at least that journal may be supposed to be well informed—the white race in that State has sunk to a condition of pitiable imbecility. The whites, according to *The Whig*, are utterly dependent on the negroes. Without, at least, one negro, no white man is capable of filling any position of usefulness or respectability. *This serves to account for the immense number of Virginia loafers with which Washington always swarms, and the low level to which, in point both of intelligence and industry, the Ancient Dominion has sunk.*"

Such an article, copied into every Virginia local paper—and readers assured that it came from the leading Republican gazette at the North, and from New York City—would singly exasperate the people of the "Ancient Dominion." But this mode of exasperation, persistently followed down to the very fall of Sumter, must have been powerful in effect. Every trivial occasion was embraced to aid the Southern exasperation. A large number of Southern divines and laymen are attending the anniversaries of May, 1858—these gentlemen are representative men. At a purely business meeting, a Greeleyan reporter takes down everything calculated to annoy them ; and the proceedings headed in this sensation style :

the right of Secession ; (x) for its moral briberies with editorial in-

*Fac-simile heading, Tribune, May 13, 1858 :*

**THE ANNIVERSARIES.**  
**THE AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY.**  
**AN EXCITING DISCUSSION.**  
**The Slaveholders Triumphant.**

Whilst the Peace Congress was in session and many patriots in the regular Congress "strengthening and establishing struggling brethren in the border Slave States," Horace Greeley is clinging to the Chicago Platform ! He writes thus on Washington's birthday, 1861 :

" In view of all these considerations, we beseech our friends everywhere to stand firm, *to adhere to the Chicago Platform*, and to hold those who demand of us a surrender of our cherished principles as our deadliest enemies. If this Government is to be dissolved, if anarchy and confusion are to follow, and if the Republican party, which has achieved so signal a victory for Humanity and Freedom, is to be consigned to oblivion, let it not be said of us that we were afraid to place ourselves upon the rock of truth, or that we confided too sparingly to the patriotism and intelligence of the people."

President Lincoln understood the crisis, when about this time he related his characteristic anecdote of his being like the man who fell heir to an immense mansion, certain parts of which were secretly mined with gunpowder, for which search must be made with candle-light.

Thirteen days later than the last editorial, Mr. Seward showed that he also understood the crisis. In a Horace Greeley editorial, March 7, 1861, is the following—intended, perhaps, for sarcasm ; but quoted, now nearly a year afterward, is sarcastic ; not, however, on Mr. Seward !

" The citizens of Illinois now in Washington called on Mr. Seward after the inauguration, and in response to their congratulations, he said : ' Gentlemen—If you want to save this Administration, and have it successful and profitable to the country, I implore you to remember that the battle for Freedom has been fought and won. Henceforth forget that Freedom ever was in danger, and exert your best influence now to save the Union. Let it not be said that the Republican party of the United States won its first, last, and only victory, over the dissolution of the Union.' One of his visitors remarked : ' Governor, I want the integrity of the Republican party maintained.' Mr. Seward responded : ' Remember, that the way to maintain the integrity of the Republican party is to maintain

fluence or silence ; for its editorial tampering with bench and jury;

the Union. Remember that the point at which the enemy strikes is always the point which you should defend.' Mr. Lovejoy interposed and added : ' And remember that the Union is worth nothing except so long as there is Freedom in it.' To this Mr. Seward replied : ' Freedom is always in the Union.' "

NOTE (x). No one now doubts that for many years certain of the Southern politicians meditated a crippling of Army and Navy—looking toward two confederacies. Whether Horace Greeley did or did not must be left to history. The writer now presents the public with many editorials they may have forgotten.

The following is from an H. G. editorial on reforms in Congress, June 11, 1858 :

" *The Army.*—Of all solecisms, a Standing Army in a Republic of the XIXth Century is the most indefensible. The abuse is so monstrous that it is difficult to bring arguments against it, from the incredibility of supposing it seriously defended by any save those who profit by it. From the coarse knaverys whereby young simpletons and older bacchanals are seduced to enlist, through the smarter rascallities of the sutler's craft, to the enormous and absurd squanderings of the transportation service, all is ineffably disgusting. We have sent regiment after regiment to the Pacific coast at a cost of not less than \$1,000 per man before they are in position for actual service, when a more effective force could have been mustered right there, fully equipped and eager for action, at a cost of less than \$100 per man. Wretched affair as the Mexican War was, it did teach us that American volunteers, decently led, are a full match for any regulars that can be got up on this Continent. When men enough can be found to volunteer for such a war, ready to fight in such a cause twelve or fifteen hundred miles from home, and do actually fight well there, under such Generals as Pierce and Pillow, it ought to be accounted high treason even to suggest the maintenance of a regular army thereafter. *Leave West Point, General Scott, two Major-Generals, four Brigadiers and an effective Staff, with at most two thousand crippled or invalid veterans to take care of fortresses, and encourage the formation of efficient volunteer companies, regiments and brigades of Militia by liberal bounties to the best organized and drilled, and the deposit of a good musket or rifle in every dwelling whose master will give security for its safe-keeping and return when required,* and we have no more need of a Standing Army than of an order of nobility. The saving by the utter disbandment and disuse of such an Army, regarded as a movable force, and the substitution therefor of capable and prudent Wardens of the frontiers, with the rank of Colonels and power to call out a limited number of volunteers for a month's service whenever required—said month to be extended to three at the discretion of the General commanding on that whole frontier—would save at least Five Millions per annum immediately, and ultimately not less than Ten Millions. And this, though it may be ever so obstinately resisted, will yet be done.

" *The Navy—To sell out the Navy Yards to the highest bidder, saving only the best one, if any—to burn or lay up under cover all our old and nearly all our large sailing vessels—to*

stop the appointment of any more captains, lieutenants, or midshipmen, while there shall be already officers of these grades respectively 'waiting orders'—that is, doing nothing—and to transform our National vessels propelled by steam into Mail Packets, running on the more or the less important routes, according to their value and swiftness, allowing them to carry passengers and freight within their capacity, as well as mails—these are the outlines of a system of naval reform which would save Five Millions per annum to the Treasury, and render the Navy far more useful than it is. *We may enlarge on this head at another time.*"

Whilst every loyal journal at the North (Jan., 1861) was preparing the public mind, and especially the commercial world, for the "impending crisis," Horace Greeley was painting the benefits (!) of secession thus (*Tribune*, January 26, 1861):

"It seems impossible for the Slaveholding States to do, or refuse to do, anything that will not redound to the advantage of the Free States.

"As we have shown already, the Secession movement is bringing business and prosperity to the North, which will increase daily until the South shall be of no account whatever, except as a cotton-field. Its agricultural production will be the same as now, but even its mechanic industry, in its present limited forms, will desert it, and its commerce will cease to exist. Those important branches of its prosperity will be wholly lopped off, and their sap and vigor transferred to stimulate Northern growth.

"Already our Northern cities, and New York in particular, are feeling a quickening of their trading pulses from the very partial interruption of business at the Southern seaports. And this is but the beginning. The ports of Mobile, and Savannah, and New Orleans, are still full of shipping, bearing away the products of the Southern country and of the Mississippi Valley. But when they shall have departed—that will be the end of commerce at those ports. There cannot be less than four hundred ships now loading in the various harbors of the South.

"When this whole business shall have been transferred to Northern channels by the shutting of Southern ports, and thrown upon Northern cities, it is impossible to overestimate the amount of profit that will be reaped by our commercial and financial circles. The present banking capital of this city will be wholly inadequate to the transaction of the new business they will have to do. Our wharves and warehouses will be overloaded with Southern products. Our docks will be choked with foreign and domestic shipping. Our railroads will, with their present resources and accommodations, struggle in vain to keep up with their fast-accruing burdens of transportation.

"Our steamers and sailing craft, luggers and towboats, our mechanics and laboring men in any way connected, directly or indirectly, with commercial and shipping circles, will know an activity of employment never before experienced. Every other branch of traffic will feel a corresponding impulse, in a greater or less degree.

"Such is sure to be the commercial effects of Secession upon this city, and like results will be experienced in every other great commercial emporium of the Free States, and throughout the maritime parts of the country."

The writer here inserts (without comment) the following H. G. editorials :

*From the Tribune, Dec. 17, 1860.*

“THE RIGHT OF SECESSION.

“The Albany *Evening Journal* courteously controverts our views on the subject of Secession. Here is the gist of its argument :

“ ‘ ‘ ‘ Seven or eight States’ ’ have ‘ pretty unanimously made up their minds’ ’ to leave the Union. Mr. Buchanan, in reply, says that ‘ ours is a Government of popular opinion,’ and hence, if States rebel, there is no power residing either with the Executive or in Congress, to resist or punish. Why, then, is not this the end of the controversy? Those ‘ seven or eight States’ ’ are going out. The Government remonstrates, but acquiesces. And THE TRIBUNE regards it ‘ *uncise to undertake to resist such Secession by Federal force.* ’ ’

“ ‘ ‘ If an individual, or ‘ a single State,’ ’ commits treason, the same act in two or more individuals or two or more States is alike treasonable. And how is treason against the Federal Government to be resisted, except by ‘ Federal force’ ?

“ ‘ Precisely the same question was involved in the South Carolina Secession of 1833. But neither President Jackson, nor Congress, nor the people took this view of it. The President issued a Proclamation declaring Secession treason. Congress passed a Force Law: and South Carolina, instead of ‘ madly shooting from its sphere,’ returned, if not to her senses, back into line.’ ’

“ Does the *Journal* mean to say that if *all* the States and their people should become tired of the Union, it would be treason on their part to seek its dissolution ?

“ We have repeatedly asked those who dissent from our view of this matter to tell us frankly whether they do or do not assent to Mr. Jefferson’s statement in the Declaration of Independence that governments ‘ derive their *just* powers from the *consent of the governed*; and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, *it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it*, and to institute a new government,’ &c., &c. We *do* heartily accept this doctrine, believing it intrinsically sound, beneficent, and one that, universally accepted, is calculated to prevent the shedding of seas of human blood. AND IF IT JUSTIFIED THE SECESSION FROM THE BRITISH EMPIRE OF THREE MILLIONS OF COLONISTS IN 1776. WE DO NOT SEE WHY IT WOULD NOT JUSTIFY THE SECESSION OF FIVE MILLIONS OF SOUTHERNS FROM THE FEDERAL UNION IN 1861. If we are mistaken on this point, why does not some one attempt to show wherein and why? For our own part, while we deny the right of slaveholders to hold slaves against the will of the latter, WE CANNOT SEE HOW TWENTY MILLIONS OF PEOPLE CAN RIGHTFULLY HOLD TEN, OR EVEN FIVE, IN A DETESTED UNION WITH THEM, BY MILITARY FORCE.

“ Of course, we understand that the principle of Jefferson, like any other broad generalization, may be pushed to extreme and baleful consequences. We can see why Governor’s Island should not be at liberty to secede from the State and Nation and allow herself to be covered with French and British batteries commanding and threatening our city. There is hardly a great principle which may not be thus ‘ run into the ground.’ But if seven or eight contiguous States shall present

themselves authentically at Washington, saying, 'We hate the Federal Union: we have withdrawn from it; we give you the choice between acquiescing in our secession and arranging amicably all incidental questions on the one hand, and attempting to subdue us on the other'—we could not stand up for coercion, for subjugation, for we do not think it would be just. We hold the right of Self-Government sacred, even when invoked in behalf of those who deny it to others. So much for the question of Principle.

"Now as to the matter of Policy :

"South Carolina will certainly secede. Several other Cotton States will probably follow her example. The Border States are evidently reluctant to do likewise. South Carolina has grossly insulted them by her dictatorial, reckless course. What she expects and desires is a clash of arms with the Federal Government, which will at once commend her to the sympathy and co-operation of every slave State, and to the sympathy (at least) of the pro-slavery minority in the free States. It is not difficult to see that this would speedily work a political revolution, which would restore to slavery all, and more than all, it has lost by the canvass of 1860. We want to obviate this. We would expose the seceders to odium as disunionists, not commend them to pity as the gallant though mistaken upholders of the rights of their section in an unequal military conflict.

"We fully realize that the dilemma of the incoming Administration will be a critical one. It must endeavor to uphold and enforce the laws, as well against rebellious slaveholders as fugitive slaves. The new President must fulfill the obligations assumed in his inauguration oath, no matter how shamefully his predecessor may have defied them. We fear that Southern madness may precipitate a bloody collision that all must deplore. *But if ever 'seven or eight States' send agents to Washington to say, 'We want to get out of the Union,' we shall feel constrained by our devotion to Human Liberty to say, Let them go!* And we do not see how we could take the other side without coming in direct conflict with those Rights of Man which we hold paramount to all political arrangements, however convenient and advantageous."

*From the Tribune, 24th December, 1860.*

"Most certainly we believe that governments are made for peoples, not peoples for governments—that the latter 'derive their just power from the consent of the governed'; and whenever a portion of this Union, large enough to form an independent, self-subsisting nation, shall see fit to say, authentically, to the residue, 'We want to get away from you,' we shall say—and we trust self-respect, if not regard for the principle of self-government, will constrain the residue of the American people to say—'Go!' We never yet had so poor an opinion of ourselves, or our neighbors, as to wish to hold others in a hated connection with us. But the dissolution of a government cannot be effected in the time required for knocking down a house of cards. Let the cotton States, or any six or more States, say, unequivocally, 'We want to get out of the Union,' and propose to effect their end peaceably and inoffensively, and we will do our best to help them out—not that we want them to go, but that we loathe the idea of compelling them to stay. All we ask is, that they exercise a reasonable patience, so as to give time for effecting their end without bloodshed. They must know, as well as we do, that no President can

recognize a mere State ordinance of secession, nor neglect to enforce the laws of the United States throughout their whole geographical extent. It takes two to make a bargain, whether of admission or secession ; but with reasonable forbearance all may be brought about."

The same views (see motto on title-page) were expressed on the eve of the Inauguration.

The following two editorials appeared on the same date : one, in leaded type, conveying watchword to co-conspirators in Washington ; the other, to the men at Charleston—the telegraph being then in perfect operation :

*From Tribune of January 8, 1861.*

" B E W A R E !

" Some weeks ago we warned the Republicans of the Free States that a measure was being concocted at Washington, that would yield up the vital doctrine for which they struggled in the recent Presidential contest, and we urged them to let their opinions upon that subject be known to their Senators and Representatives without delay. We have reason to know that that appeal was not made in vain. We now say to the tried and true friends of our cause throughout the country, that the advocates of what is called Concession and Compromise are again at work, and with more vigor than before, to induce the Republicans in Congress to support some policy that shall humble the North and make shipwreck of our party and its creed. We renewedly call upon them to promptly make their opinions and wishes upon this question known at Washington. To this end, let them speak through their local journals, and by letters and other means of communication, so that their Senators and Representatives may have a clear knowledge of the tone of public sentiment at home. Let the friends of Free Labor and Free Government move immediately ! The crisis impends. There is no time for delay."

" A I D   F O R   A N D E R S O N !

" About the time that this journal reaches our readers this morning, the gallant Anderson and his devoted band, who have so sturdily upheld the flag of their country within the walls of Fort Sumter, will find that in the hour of their peril their country has not deserted them. With the gray dawn of the day, wind and weather favoring, the brave fellows at the fort will see steaming toward them the Star of the West, under command of Capt. McGowan, with the stars and stripes at her peak, bearing aid and succor, men and munitions to the beleaguered fortress. It is now very generally understood that the hurried and SECRET mission on which the steamer left here on Saturday evening was, to transport a body of United States troops from Governor's Island to Fort Sumter. The men were quietly put on board from a steamtug in the lower bay, under cover of the night, and are supposed to have gone down under command of Col. Thomas, Gen. Scott's executive officer. The Star of the West also took a large quantity of stores and fuel, of which Major Anderson is said to stand in need."

for malicious mischief generally, and as approximating to the common scold at common law. (y)

But you, my dear Hoxie, in a serene old age, will become less a "Poor Joe" than shall your false friend of twenty years' standing. For you, as well as others causelessly maligned by this diseased self-consciousness, will become one of the class who possess the honor versified by Bulwer Lytton in his "New Timon :"

" Honor to him, who, self-complete and brave  
In scorn, can carve his pathway to the grave ;  
And, heeding naught of what men think or say,  
Make his own heart his world upon the way."

Most faithfully, my dear Hoxie,

Your obliged friend,

A. OAKLEY HALL.

NEW YORK CITY, Dec. 13, 1861.(z)

NOTE (y). Under the head of "Nuisance," Sir William Blackstone thus comments (4 Bl. Com., 168) :

"Eaves-droppers, or such as listen under walls or windows, or the eaves of a house, to hearken after discourse and thereupon to frame slanderous and mischievous tales, are a common nuisance and presentable at the Court Leet. Lastly, a common scold (*communis rixatrix*—for our law Latin confines it to the feminine gender) is a public nuisance to her neighborhood. For which offense she may be indicted, and, if convicted, shall be sentenced to be placed in a certain engine of correction, called the trebucket castigatory, orucking stool, which in the Saxon language is said to signify the scolding stool : though now it is frequently corrupted into ducking stool, because the residue of the judgment is, that when she is placed therein she shall be plunged in the water for her punishment."

NOTE (z). Lest it should be charged that the few extracts from Horace Greeley's editorials, herein contained, are unfairly selected from a twenty years' range of his pen, when many things may be barred by a statute of limitations every public man may claim benefit of, it is proper to add, that with the exception of the secession articles, and one or two later, the bulk of the extracts or proofs are from a *half-year file of his paper* during the Lecompton fight (1858), when H. G. was particularly 'on the rampage'—and they are set up from the *Tribune* type! Did the writer possess time and control space enough, he could accumulate proof that would build a logical pyramid.

[While these sheets are going through the press, and on the very same day when Senator Henry S. Lane electrified the Senate galleries by declaring he would sustain the war by taxing the last dollar—sustain it until every individual was bankrupt,

and he himself laid in a pauper's grave by pauper hands—Horace Greeley publishes his Almanac, placing the Rebel Congress side by side with the Union Congress in lists of members!!]

Senator Garrett Davis, of Kentucky, in his speech, duly reported in Horace Greeley's paper, January 26th, 1862, thus hit a nail very squarely upon its head :

“These fanatics, these political and social demons, come here, breathing pestilence from Pandemonium, trying to destroy this Union, so as to secure over its broken fragments the emancipation of slavery. They oppose Mr. Lincoln, as honest and pure a man as ever lived, because he stands by the Constitution, and is opposed to interfering with slavery. The utterances they have dared to put forth in this city have desecrated the Smithsonian Institute. If the secessionists had dared to give expression to the same utterances, they would have been sent, and properly sent, to Fort Lafayette or Fort Warren. What will you do with these monsters? I will tell you what I would do with them, and with that horrible monster Greeley, as they come sneaking around here, like hungry wolves, after the destruction of slavery. If I had the power, I would take them and the worst seceshers and hang them in pairs. (Laughter.) I wish to God I could inflict that punishment upon them. It would be just. They are the disunionists. They are the madmen, who are willing to call up all the passion of the infernal regions, and all the horrors of a servile war. This they would carry out over the disjected fragments of a broken Constitution to obtain their unholy purposes.”







